

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-6, 8, 18 and 19 were examined in the present application. Claims 3 and 19 have been allowed. Claims 5 and 6 are deemed allowable. Claim 4 has been objected to. Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Van Den Berg (U.S. Patent 6,313,627). Claim 8 has been rejected under § 102(b) over Adelerhof (WO 00/79298). Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Adelerhof. Claim 18 has been rejected under § 103 over Adelerhof in view of Van Delden (U.S. Patent 6,100,686). Claims 2, 4, 8 and 18 have been cancelled hereby without prejudice. Claim 5 has been amended hereby. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and below remarks.

In paragraphs 36 and 37 of the Office Action, claims 3 and 19 have been allowed and claims 5 and 6 have been deemed allowable if re-written in independent form. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 3 and 19 and the allowability of claims 5 and 6. Applicants have rewritten claim 5 in independent form, incorporating all the limitations of its base claim, claim 4.

In paragraphs 5-7, claim 4 has been objected to for the use of the phrase “a second center line.” This phrase has been incorporated into newly independent claim 5 and the objection will be addressed here. Applicants understand the Examiner’s objection, but respectfully submit that Applicants’ claim language is clear. The “first” and “second” center lines recited in claim 5 are with respect to the substrate. The substrate has two center lines. The phrase “a first center line of the left side and the right side” is to define the first center line being the center of the left and right side direction. Similarly, the phrase “a second center line of the top side and the bottom side” is to define the second center line as being the center of the top and bottom side direction. The left and right sides, as a pair, and the top and bottom sides, as a pair, each only have one center lines. Applicants respectfully submit that if the claim were amended to recite “a first center line of the top side and the bottom side” this amendment would induce confusion as there would be two “first” center lines on the substrate.

If the Examiner has alternative suggestions as to how these center lines can be recited, Applicants would gladly consider any such suggestions. Otherwise, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to this recitation on this basis.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 5 and 6 are currently in condition for allowance.

In paragraphs 8-25, claims 2, 4, 8 and 18 have been rejected. Applicants have cancelled claims 2, 4, 8 and 18 without prejudice, thereby rendering moot the objection to and rejections of these claims.

Applicants have amended objected to claim 5 in independent form and have traversed the objection to the language incorporated from its base claim 4. Thus each of claims 3, 5, 6 and 19 are in condition for allowance. As each of the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance, such action is earnestly solicited.

Dated: July 19, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Michael J. Scheer/  
Michael J. Scheer

Registration No.: 34,425  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP  
2049 Century Park East Suite 700  
Los Angeles, California 90067-3109  
(310) 772-8300  
Attorney for Applicant